



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,386	11/15/2001	Joe Nathan Brown	AUS920010875US1	7328
46073	7590	02/05/2008		
IBM CORPORATION (VE) C/O VOLEL EMILE P. O. BOX 162485 AUSTIN, TX 78716			EXAMINER NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/05/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/998,386	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BROWN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Maikhanh Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2176	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2007.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12,14-21,23,25-32,34,36-43 and 45 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12,14-21,23,25-32,34,36-43 and 45 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) -<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                         |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Appeal Brief filed 11/16/2007.

Claims 1, 3-10, 12, 14-21, 23, 25-32, 34, 36-43 and 45 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 23, 34, and 45 are independent claims.


In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 11/16/2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (a) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (b) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.



DOUG HUTTON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

## Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

*(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.*

Claims 1, 4, 7, 12, 15, 18, 23, 26, 29, 34, 37, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

102(b) as being anticipated by **Bates et al.** (GB 2 336 226, Publication Date: 10/1999, hereinafter Bates'226). It is noted that the Bates reference was previously cited by the Examiner.

### As to claims 1, 12, 23, and 34:

Bates'226 teaches a method, computer program product, apparatus, and computer system of making links that are not easily identified in a displayed Web document by a user to be clearly recognizable comprising the steps of:

- displaying the Web document, the Web document have a plurality of embedded links (*e.g., the web browser displays all links on a web page; see page 2, lines 21-29; page 4, lines 1-3; page 10, lines 6-42*);
- enabling the user to issue a command (*e.g., selecting links*) to have the plurality of links embedded in the Web document to be highlighted (*e.g., appear in one color... appear in another color; see page 10, lines 7-42 and*

Art Unit: 2176

*page 13, lines 21-35); receiving the command upon issuance; and upon receiving the command (e.g., when the links are selected), displaying the Web document (e.g., displayed on web page 410) with all the plurality of embedded links highlighted (e.g., all unselected links 418... appear in one color and that all selected links 418 appear in another color... links 418 appear underlined and in bold face type; see page 10, lines 7-42 and page 13, lines 21-35).*

**As to claims 4, 15, 26, and 37:**

Bates'226 teaches the plurality of embedded links are displayed in the different color to highlight the links (e.g., *Selectable hypertext links typically appear on a web page as highlight text displayed in a different color to distinguish the hypertext links from other, non-selectable, text on the web page; page 2, lines 21-29; page 4, lines 5-16).*

**As to claims 7, 18, 29, and 40:**

Bates'226 teaches the plurality of embedded links are emboldended to highlight the links (e.g., *links 418 appear underlined and in bold face type; page 10, lines 35-44).*

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2176

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

*This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).*

Claims 3,5-6, 8-10, 14,16-17, 19-21, 25, 27-28, 30-32, 36, 38-39, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Bates'226** in view of **Bates et al.** (US 5987482, issued 11/16/1999, hereinafter **Bates'482**). It is noted that the Bates reference was previously cited by the Examiner.

**As to claims 3, 14, 25, and 36:**

Bates'482 teaches the plurality of embedded links flash to highlight the links (*e.g., blinking; col. 9, lines5-18*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bates'226 with Bates'482 because it would have provided flexibility when highlighting hyperlinks in a web document.

**As to claims 5, 16, 27, and 38:**

Bates'482 teaches the plurality of embedded are displayed using a larger font to highlight the links (*e.g., different colors, font face/sizes, styles; col. 9, lines5-18*).

Art Unit: 2176

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bates'226 with Bates'482 because it would have provided flexibility when highlighting hyperlinks in a web document.

**As to claim 6, 17, 28, and 39:**

Bates'482 teaches the plurality of embedded are displayed using a different font to highlight the links (*e.g., different colors, font face/sizes, styles; col. 9, lines5-18*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bates'226 with Bates'482 because it would have provided flexibility when highlighting hyperlinks in a web document.

**As to claims 8, 19, 30, and 41:**

Bates'482 teaches the plurality of embedded links are displayed using an enlarged and the links target area enlarged to highlight the links (*col.9, lines 19-col. 10, line 29; see also figs. 9-11 and associated text*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bates'226 with Bates'482 because it would have provided flexibility when highlighting hyperlinks in a web document.

Art Unit: 2176

**As to claims 9, 20, 31, and 42:**

Bates'482 teaches the plurality of embedded links are duplicated and displayed in a different area to highlight the links (*col. 4, lines 25-40; col. 6, line 27-col.7, line 57*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bates'226 with Bates'482 because it would have provided flexibility when highlighting hyperlinks in a web document.

**As to claims 10, 21, 32, and 43:**

Bates'482 teaches when a duplicated link is selected, its corresponding link in the web document flashes using a different or larger font (*e.g., different colors, font faces/sizes, styles ... blinking; col. 9, lines 5-18*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bates'226 with Bates'482 because it would have provided flexibility when highlighting hyperlinks in a web document.

**As to claim 45:**

The rejection of claim 1 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, claim 45 recites: asserting an icon in the browser, the icon being able to toggle on to highlight the links and to toggle off to de-highlight the links; and enlarging the plurality of links and the target areas upon user command to highlighting the plurality of the links, the user command including toggling on the icon.



Bates'482 teaches asserting an icon in the browser, the icon being able to toggle on to highlight the links and to toggle off to de-highlight the links (*e.g., determine whether internal links have been enabled. In particular, a user may be given the option of disabling internal links so that the links may not be navigated, or may not even be shown... by setting the display properties for internal links to be that of the surrounding text such that the links are not highlighted to a user. Also, the selection of internal links may be disabled in the link selection handling routines for the browser; col. 7, lines 35-57*); and enlarging the plurality of links and the target areas upon user command to highlighting the plurality of the links, the user command including toggling on the icon (*col.9, lines 19-col. 10, line 29; see also figs. 9-11 and associated text*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bates'226 with Bates'482 because it would have provided flexibility when highlighting hyperlinks in a web document.

### **Response to Arguments**

4. Applicant's arguments filed 11/16/2007 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### **Conclusion**

5. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention. Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

### **Contact information**

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Art Unit: 2176

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call  
800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MN

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**